

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of	Atty. Docket: NL 021492
JOHANNUS WILHELMUS WEEKAMP ET AL.	Group Art Unit: 2895
Serial No. 10/539,314	Examiner: SINGAL, A.K.
Filed: JUNE 15, 2005	Confirmation No. 2479
Title: ELECTRONIC DEVICE HAVING IMPROVED ISOLATION AND METHOD OF MANUFACTURING SAME (As Amended)	

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answers mailed on September 4,  
2008, please consider the following remarks:

REMARKS

Appellants maintain the arguments submitted in the Appeal Brief filed on October 30, 2007, which are incorporated herein by reference. Further, Appellants refute the allegations made in the Examiner's Answer of September 4, 2008.

At the outset, Appellants gratefully acknowledge and agree with the Examiner that the status of Claims include claims 1-10 where claims 11-12 had been canceled.

Regarding the allegation on page 11 of the Examiner's Answer that the claims do not mention a limitation related to providing isolation material through the foil to form an encapsulation of the elements, it is true that the claims recite providing passivating material, and not isolating material.

However, assuming that the passivating material is not isolating material, independent claims 1 and 8 recite providing passivating material through the foil or through the second patterned layer to form an encapsulation of the elements.

In stark contrast, Nakatani merely discloses forming holes in an uncured resin sheet 704 to form vias 705 which are filled with conductive paste, and then curing the resin sheet 704. That it,

vias 705 are merely filled.

Nakatani does not disclose or suggest any foil through which a passivating material is provided to form an encapsulation. Nakatani is completely silent about any material passing through anything. Rather, Nakatani merely discloses filling a hole with conductive paste, which is different from providing a passivating material through a foil or through a patterned layer, as recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 8 are allowable, and allowance thereof is respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-7 and 9-10 are allowable at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 8.

In addition, Appellants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Appellants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of


the Examiner's statements are conceded.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-10 are patentable over Lorentz and Nakatani.

Thus, the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-10 should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
November 4, 2008

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101